

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: August 2, 2000
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
July 27, 2000

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Darrell Alder	City of Washougal Council Member (P)
Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member (P)
Jay Cerveny	City of La Center Council Member (P)
Dean Dossett	City of Camas Mayor (P)
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member (A)
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member (P)
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners

(P) Primary (A) Alternate

Public:

Foster Church	The Oregonian
Ken Hadley	CCAR
Jessica Hoffman	Clark County Home Builders
Tom Jacobs	Cascade SE Neighborhood Association
Alison Mielke	Friends of Clark County
Pam Neal	Columbia River Economic Development Council
Randall Olsen	Southwest Washington Health District
Stuart Myers Stapleton	The JD White Company
George Vartanian	Self

Staff:

Jose Alvarez	Clark County Long Range Planning
Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director

Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development Director
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Mike Conway	City of Washougal Public Works Director
Tamara DeRidder	City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Director
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Elise Scolnick	Clark County Long Range Planning
Brian Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Josh Warner	Clark County Community Development

Introductions / Roll Call

Called to order at 4:00 PM by Commissioner Craig Pridemore. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

Approve June 14 Steering Committee Notes

No corrections. Notes accepted as published.

Policy Questions Handout

Commissioner Craig Pridemore handed out a list of proposed Comprehensive Plan policy questions to be addressed by the Board of County Commissioners in the 2000-2001 Plan Review. This is list to begin to set the scope of the review.

Plan Monitoring Report Presentation

Oliver Orjiako, Clark County Long Range Planning, gave a summary presentation of the Plan Monitoring Report. The information that he summarized is included in the Executive Summary of the Plan Monitoring Report.

Commissioner Judy Stanton questioned the percentages presented in the Executive Summary and in the document itself because they are different. Staff will investigate to see which numbers are correct.

Jeanne Harris, City of Vancouver Council Member, had a question on the Camas Meadows note in the Executive Summary. Oliver Orjiako explained that in 1995 the area was residential. The City of Camas annexed the property and in 1996 and zoned the area as zoned industrial. The 600 acre area accounts for one-third of the 60 percent of available vacant and underutilized residential land absorbed since 1995 and may lead to a misrepresentation in the numbers.

In discussing the 60/40 housing split staff pointed out that there is currently an 80/20 split between single and multifamily housing. It was also pointed out that the current

numbers are slightly different than the original numbers because of changes in the definition of multifamily.

Jack Burkman, City of Vancouver Council Member, questioned the accuracy of the data. He sees a dramatic shift in numbers for Vancouver and encourages work to make sure the numbers are correct. Staff agreed to review the data with TAC and follow-up will take place to make sure it is correct.

In discussing density it was pointed out that the dwelling units per acre vary by jurisdiction. Jack Burkman questions the numbers because of a large change from the previous report to this report. Brian Snodgrass, City of Vancouver Planner, said that the numbers (from internal work by the City of Vancouver) may be different because the reports used different methodologies. Oliver Orjiako stated that the reports may be looking at different areas. Staff will review this further for clarification.

Jack Burkman posed a question about population growth. He said the percentage increases are trending downwards since 1995 and questions why the data is not displayed to show this fact. This is important because the trends can drive conclusions and policy decisions.

Commissioner Pridemore said that the intent of the report is a snapshot. The forecasting portion will become more salient soon. Jack Burkman asks if there will be more trend analysis in addition to what already exists.

Dean Dossett, City of Camas Mayor, wants to know what methodology was used to arrive at the numbers that are in the report. Commissioner Pridemore asked what is the best way to present the methodology. Oliver Orjiako pointed out that some methodological information is in Appendix A of the Monitoring Report.

Jeanne Harris feels a presentation is necessary to give a better understanding to the Committee of the methodology. Pat Lee, Clark County Long Range Planning Manager, said that staff from several jurisdictions were closely consulted in the construction of methodology. Staff level coordination has been good. Jack Burkman suggests that individuals go back to staff and then come back to the Committee with specific questions or disputes that may exist among staff.

Pat Lee states that 4-5 areas have been changed and these can be presented to the Committee in a future meeting.

Brian Snodgrass reviewed the summary document that he presented to the Committee. The document covers much of the same ground as the policy papers, but in a highly condensed fashion. The summary tries to frame the intent, where direction is from, whether or not the policy is being implemented, and what are the key issues.

Review 60/40 Single Family – Multi-family new units ration policy

Pat Lee introduced the issue stating that there are two main discussion issues:

1. The split is not being met, it is closer to 80/20.

2. How is the policy to be applied? Will each jurisdiction meet the goal individually or is it an overall average in the county?

Not all jurisdictions have the same definitions for single and multifamily and the terminology can be confusing.

Commissioner Pridemore suggested that the 60/40 discussion be linked to the 6/16 density issue as well. Rich Lowry, Clark County Deputy Prosecuting Attorney stated that the Hearings Board views the 60/40 goal as an affordability and density issue.

Pat Lee pointed out that though the County is lagging in meeting the multifamily housing goal, the existing multifamily is meeting the density goal at 16 units per acre. Single-family is not attaining the goal of six units per acre on average.

Rich Lowry said that in the plan monitoring process (SB 6094) if the County is not meeting assumptions set out in the original Comprehensive Plan it is necessary to make adjustments before the UGB can be expanded.

Jeanne Harris wants more clarification between city and county responsibilities to meet the 60/40. Commissioner Pridemore said that the County role is to set overall goals. Cities can set own policies to encourage or discourage attaining the goal.

Commissioner Betty Sue Morris says it is a zoning level issue to attain the goals. Rich Lowry asserted that the remand from the Hearings Board obligates the cities to meet the goals. Pat Lee pointed out that Comprehensive Plan Policy 5.7.1 adopted by local jurisdictions is the text that the Hearings Board accepted in response to the remand.

Pat Lee reviewed with the Committee the six *Options for Change* in the 60/40 policy paper. Jack Buckman raised the issue of the multifamily assumption in constructing the Comprehensive Plan and what it will mean on the ground. What is the best way to meet the mix of housing needs? He stated that the amount of multifamily in the city is a sensitive issue to Vancouver because it is a large jurisdiction.

Commissioner Pridemore posed the question of how we are going to meet the goals of the Comprehensive Plan – using density and/or mix of housing types.

In response Dean Dosset questions why 60/40 has not been met by the jurisdictions, with the exception of Vancouver. He feels that builders are making the decisions because of economic reasons and that we need to look at the issue of housing mix from a regional perspective, not by single jurisdiction.

Commissioner Morris asked a hypothetical question about GMA. If a city reaches its 75 percent mark to move the UGB, but has not attained the 60/40 split, can the UGB be moved? The question goes to whether or not the 75 percent land consumption is the sole force in moving the UGB. Pat Lee stated that the two concepts of land consumption and housing type are probably not directly tied together, though an attempt to move the UGB without having attained the 60/40 might get challenged in court. A jurisdiction would likely need to show that they made reasonable efforts to get the ratio through policy prescriptions.

Jay Cervený, City of La Center Council Member, feels that density could be a problem with meeting the 60/40 goal. He asked if the 60/40 policy is iron clad. Commissioner

Pridemore responded that the intent of GMA is to help direct the market. The idea of planning is to try to attain the goals. Commissioner Morris stated that the rule is not iron clad and there is flexibility as the requirements for density etc. vary greatly from county to county within Washington State. Clark County decided on the 60/40 itself as a part of the remand from the Hearings Board.

John Idsinga, City of Battle Ground Council Member, questioned why we do not simply rely on what the market tells us for housing needs. If apartments are needed won't they be built? Is 60/40 the right split? Should it be changed?

Tamara DeRidder, City of Vancouver Long Range Planning Director, asked which jurisdictions allow single family to be built in zones designated as multi-family? Vancouver does not allow this to happen. She stated that there needs to be the opportunity to build multifamily, even if it isn't built.

Commissioner Pridemore posed the question that if the housing type policy is changed to a 75/25 can the UGBs still be moved? Jack Buckman responded by asking what we want the communities to look like in 25 - 30 years. He feels that this is the question that should drive the decision to change or not change the policy. In former discussions there was a desire to meet density that comes with the 60/40 and 6/16 policies.

Pat Lee directs the Committee back to the *Options for Change* in the policy paper. John Idsinga asked if each jurisdiction can have its own split. Commissioner Pridemore stated that it is the County's responsibility to set the policy direction. He also asserted that affordability was part of the remand. Dean Dossett then asked what is affordability? Commissioner Stanton and Jack Burkman replied that affordability represents a need for a mix of housing types to meet a variety of needs. They said that it is not a specific dollar amount. Commissioner Morris said there are two elements of affordability - single and multifamily for different types of needs. Not everyone wants or needs a single-family dwelling.

Pat Lee said that currently the county jurisdictions are at about 8.5 dwellings/acre. If the 60/40 goal is attained it would provide about 10 dwellings/acre as is outlined in policy paper #5.

Commissioner Pridemore said that all jurisdictions need to contribute to the goal. Pat Lee again stated that if the goals are challenged for lack of attainment, the test will be to demonstrate that the jurisdiction set policy that would lead to the goal even if it was not attained.

Jeanne Harris brought up the issue of tax base inequity if all housing is in one jurisdiction and the business/industry is in another jurisdiction. More resources will be demanded in the jurisdiction where the housing is located but the jurisdiction with the employment base will be reaping the higher tax base.

Commissioner Morris questioned what a good figure for urban density actually is. She suggests that four units per acre might be urban. She asked staff to check on this and stated that the number might be in the CTED document. There were questions as to if this number is gross or net acres.

Other

Commissioner Pridemore asked for feedback from jurisdictions to the County Board of Commissioners on the plan review process. He said the timeframe is to have most of the input by January. This can be through the Committee, to the County Planning Commission, or directly at the public hearings conducted by the Board of County Commissioners.

Brian Snodgrass asks if individual jurisdictional numbers were available on single and multifamily zoning by jurisdiction.

TAC Update

Pat Lee informed the Committee that there are three more policy papers on the way. They are population and employment allocation, buildable land inventory (SB 6094), and school siting policy.

Future meeting schedule

Jack Burkman suggested future meetings be held on a regular schedule of the 2nd and 4th Thursdays of each month. That recommendation was agreed to and the meetings will be held at alternating sites.

Adjourned

The Steering Committee adjourned at 6:05 PM.

\\county7\hbwg\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - july 27 2000.doc